

10/693,717

MS306958.01/MSFTP545USA

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10-20 and 22-24 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 10-12, 15, and 22-24 have been amended to further clarify what applicants regard as the invention – no new matter has been added.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection to Claim 24

Claim 24 is objected to because of a minor informality. Claim 24 is amended, and recites dependency from claim 23. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

II. New Matter Objection and Rejection of Claims 1, 12, 15 Under 35 U.S.C §112

Independent claims 1, 12, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §112, first paragraph, as introducing new matter, and failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The accessor component recited in independent claims 1, 12, and 15 is clearly illustrated in Fig. 5 (numeral 520), and discussed within the subject Specification at pages 30-31, for example. Moreover, claim 15 is directed to breaking a dependency, wherein the dependency itself - (and not the breaking act) - is being implemented by the accessor component. Applicants' representative submits that no new matter has been added, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 1-8, 10-20 and 22-24 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-8, 10-20 and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Microsoft XP version 5.1, in view of "Algorithm Solutions Software GmbH", 2002/10/16, Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons. The suggested combination of references does not disclose the claimed invention

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the

10/693,717

MS306958.01/MSFTP545USA

references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skilled in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art and not based on the Applicant's disclosure. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicants' claimed invention is directed to a first executable application including one or more functions that are registered in a registry component, and an extension component that reads function data from the registry and binds a second executable application to the first. Moreover, an **accessor component** facilitates relating information across **different domains** via at least one of a resolve and link of values associated with binding the first executable application and the second executable application. Such aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed by Microsoft XP version 5.1 in view of "Algorithm Solutions Software GmbH".

The cited example in the Office Action pertains to a user selecting "File" → "Folder" → "New Folder", to create a new personal folder in Microsoft XP version 5.1. Such operation occurs in a same **domain** of a folder creation (*e.g.*, application relating to personal folder creation), and hence is not across **different domains** (*e.g.*, across an e-mail application and a calendar application), as in applicant's claimed invention. Also, the cited example does not employ an **accessor component** to resolve a link between the different applications, as in the subject claims.

Moreover, the "Algorithm Solutions Software GmbH", fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of the example for Microsoft XP version 5.1, as cited in the Office Action. "Algorithm Solutions Software GmbH" relates to a data accessor that decouples data access from underlying implementation. It is not clear how the Office Action construes this reference to obtain the accessor component of the subject claims – the "Algorithm Solutions Software GmbH" on page 3, second paragraph recites:

"[...] *it does not make sense* to provide a **function set** [...]".

Yet, the accessor component of the claimed invention employs a plurality of functions for conditional class queries that execute in a set oriented matter to resolve/link the first executable

10/693,717

MS306958.01/MSFTP545USA

application with the second executable application. Thus, the "Algorithm Solutions Software GmbH" teaches away from the claimed invention.

Independent claim 1 recites "an *accessor component* that facilitates relating information across *different domains* [...] resolve and link for values associated with a bind [...]." Likewise independent claim 12 recites "*resolving* a value via an *accessor component*", and independent claim 15 recites "the dependency created in part via an *accessor component*". Such aspects of the claimed invention are disclosed by combining Microsoft XP version 5.1, and "Algorithm Solutions Software GmbH" as suggested in the Office Action.

In view of the at least above comments, it is readily apparent that the cited references, alone or in combination, do not disclose applicants' invention as recited in independent claim 1, (and claims 2-8, 10, 11 dependent therefrom), independent claim 12 (and claims 13, 14 dependent therefrom), and independent claim 15 (and claims 16-20, 22-24 dependent therefrom) - and this rejection should be withdrawn.

10/693,717

MS306958.01/MSFTP545USA

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP545USA].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731